REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 13 –24 remain in the application. Claims 13 and 19 have been amended.

Claims 1 - 12 had been previously canceled.

More specifically, with regard to the claim amendments, the independent claims

have been further clarified with regard to the assignment of "valid" or "invalid" to the

symptoms and its effect on the reporting of the symptom validation data. If the item

of symptom validation is "valid" then the system reports the classification. If the item

of symptom validation is "invalid" then the system reports a reporting data item that is

assigned to the classification.

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended. The Examiner's objection on

page 2 of the Office action, and the suggestion, are appreciated. In addition to the

suggested change, applicant has also removed the parenthetical expressions with

the reference numerals from the Abstract.

The objection to the disclosure has been noted. It is respectfully believed that the

verb form "derive" is proper in lines 3 and 4 of page 6.

The listing of the guidelines concerning the preferred layout of the specification has

been noted. The preliminary amended submitted with the national stage application

contained a section "Amendments to the Specification" in which the suggested sub-

8 of 10

Response submitted February 23, 2007

headings were inserted into the translated text. The Examiner is requested to

confirm that the subheadings have indeed been inserted.

We now turn to the art rejection in which claims 13 and 19 have been rejected as

being anticipated by Ogata (JP 2-039397) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). We respectfully

traverse.

To begin with, we do indeed agree with the Examiner that the remaining claims are

indeed patentable over the reference Ogata. In that regard, the indicated allowability

of claims 14-18 and 20-24 is appreciatively noted.

With reference to claims 13 and 19, we respectfully point to the above distinction – in

the process and in the system – between the assignment of the items "valid" and

"invalid" to the symptom. Ogata does not contain any disclosure that would point to

the fundamentally different reporting treatment, namely, that if the item of symptom

validation is "valid" then the system reports the classification and, if the item of

symptom validation is "invalid" then the system reports a reporting data item that is

assigned to the classification.

Reference is had to Fig. 2 and the corresponding description. The figure also shows

the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art reference Ogata.

Diagnostic systems which are suitable to classify fault data are known in the art.

Typically, they are based on complicated algorithmic processing on the basis of

mathematical models.

9 of 10

S3-03P07677 - Application No. 10/566,560

Response to Office action 9/28/2006

Response submitted February 23, 2007

The invention pursues a different route in order to improve a corresponding system

with regard to the effort required. The invention provides for simple further-

processing and display of the symptoms on the basis of the classification and the

assignment of validation information. In the case that the information item assigned

to a symptom indicates that the symptom is "valid," then the validation information

and the classification are reported. In the case, however, that the validation

information indicates that the symptom is "invalid," only an item is reported which is

associated with the classification. The process and the system are thus simplified to

a considerable degree.

In other words, the claimed invention enables a simple yet very effective concept for

validating fault symptoms. Neither the process nor the system are described, or fairly

taught, in the prior art reference Ogata. The allowance of the claims is solicited.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for two months in the

amount of \$450.00 is submitted concurrently. Please charge any other fees which

might be due to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

/Werner H. Stemer/

Werner H. Stemer

Reg. No. 34,956

WHS:lq - February 23, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP

P.O. Box 2480

Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480

Tel.: 954-925-1100

Fax: 954.925.1101

10 of 10